

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| In re Application of: |) | Group Art Unit: 3767 |
| |) | |
| LISCIO et al. |) | Confirmation No.: 5714 |
| |) | |
| Filed: 26 November 2003 |) | Examiner: Prasad, Sonal |
| |) | |
| Serial No.: 10/723,183 |) | Docket No.: MR/02-021 |
| |) | |
| For: CONTINUOUS BATTERY |) | |
| CHARGER SYSTEM |) | Date: 25 July 2006 |

MAIL STOP AMENDMENT
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE
TO
OFFICE ACTION MAILED 25 JANUARY 2006

Dear Sir/Madam:

Applicants acknowledge receipt of an Office Action dated 25 January 2006 concerning the patent application cited above for which claims 1-3 have previously been withdrawn. According to the Office Action, the application is deficient in the following respects:

(1) Claims 4-8, 12-14, 18-21, 25-27, 30 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0169415 A1 to *Staats et al.*

The Examiner noted, however, that claims 9-11, 15-17, 22-24, 28, 29, 31 and 33, though objected to, would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response to the Office Action, Applicants herein present arguments in support of their belief that all claims are novel over the *Staats et al.* reference.